

**REMARKS****INTRODUCTION**

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 5 and 11-14 have been cancelled. Claims 1-4, 6-10 and 15-30 are pending and under consideration.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103**

Claims 1, 3 and 4 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat et al. (US 2003/138008) (hereinafter “Riazat”) in view of Spangler (US 5,547,385) (hereinafter “Spangler”).

Riazat discusses high-speed to-can optoelectronic packages. In Riazat, a header 804 may be formed with a ground post 808 for grounding the package. A pair of laser posts 810 and 812 may also extend through the header 804 into the interior region for connection to a laser diode 814. The laser 814 may be mounted vertically onto a silicon submount 816, which would otherwise be mounted ordinarily around the central portion of a header for surface emitting lasers. Riazat, paragraph [0048].

Spangler teaches blind mating guides on a backwards compatible connector. In Spangler, ground contacts extend along insulating alignment posts. Prior to connecting the signal contacts along the mating face of the connector with those of a mating electrical connector on the docking work station, the ground contacts on the alignment posts engage corresponding ground contacts on the mating electrical connector. Thus, the ground contacts of both connectors become engaged electrical connector before the signal contacts become engaged. Spangler, 1:51-1:58.

Further in Spangler, in greater detail, each electrical connector 2 includes insulative posts 12 and the conductive ground contacts 10 extending along the posts 12. The ground contacts 10, together with the electrical contacts 7, extend through the housing 4 and through the rear face 5. Electrical terminals 13 on the ground contacts 10 project from the rear face 5 of the housing 4 for connection to a circuit board. Spangler, 3:23-3:30 and Figure 2.

**Claims 1, 3 and 4**

Claim 1 recites: “...wherein the at least one active connector and the ground connector protrude from the laser diode so as to be electrically connectable to a laser diode driving integrated circuit and the ground connector is longer than the at least one active connector.” As stated in the Office Action, Riazat does not teach that the ground connector is longer than the

active connector. Spangler is relied upon to cure this deficiency in Riazat. However, in Spangler the electrical pins 8 and the ground pins 10 are the same length as is clearly illustrated in Figure 2 of Spangler. In Spangler, the ground contacts 10 in the receiving cavities 11 project beyond the mating face 6 of the mating electrical connector 3 to engage the ground contacts 10 in the posts 12 prior to the mating of connectors 2 and 3. In contrast to claim 1, Spangler does not discuss that ground connector is longer than the at least one active connector. In Spangler, the ground pins and the electrical pins of the connector 2 are the same length.

Claims 3 and 4 depend from claim 1 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 3 and 4 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat and Spangler, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 4 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103**

Claims 2 and 15-17 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler, and further in view of Patrick, Jr. (US 3,767,971) (hereinafter "Patrick, Jr.").

Patrick, Jr. discusses a static bleed resistor 10 featuring a discharge end 17 in the form of a sharp pointed cone to concentrate the static electricity and to simplify the ionization of the surrounding air so that static electricity may be bled from the resistor 10 to the atmosphere. Patrick, Jr., 3:11-3:15 and Figure 1.

#### **Claim 2**

Claim 2 depends on claim 1 and is therefore believed to be allowable for the foregoing reasons. Further, claim 2 recites features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler and Patrick, Jr., taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 2 recites that the end of the ground connector is acutely shaped compared to the end of the least one active connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **Claims 15-17**

Claim 15 recites: "...a ground connector longer than the at least one active connector..." Similar to the argument made for claim 1, neither Riazat, Spangler nor Patrick, Jr. discuss a ground connector longer than the at least one active connector.

Claims 16 and 17 depend from claim 15 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 16 and 17 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler and Patrick, Jr., taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 16 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **CLAIM REJECTION – 35 USC 103**

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Patrick, Jr.

Claim 5 has been cancelled.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103**

Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler, and further in view of Kjarsgaard (US 3,972,356) (hereinafter "Kjarsgaard").

Kjarsgaard discusses a lead straightening, aligning, and spacing implement for an electronic semiconductor package.

#### **Claims 6, 7, 9 and 10**

Claim 6 recites: "...a protruding portion of the ground connector is longer than a protruding portion of the at one least active connector." Similar to the argument made for claim 1, neither Riazat, Spangler nor Kjarsgaard discuss a protruding portion of the ground connector being longer than the protruding portion of the at least one active connector.

Claims 7, 9 and 10 depend from claim 6 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 7, 9 and 10 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler and Kjarsgaard, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 10 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

#### **CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103**

Claims 8 and 18-30 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in view of Spangler, Patrick, Jr. and Kjarsgaard.

**Claim 8**

Claim 8 is dependent on claim 6 and is therefore believed to allowable for at least the foregoing reasons. Further, claim 8 recites features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Patrick, Jr. and Kjarsgaard, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 8 recites that an end of the protruding portion of the ground connector is acutely shaped compared to an end of the protruding portion of the at least one active connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**Claims 18-25**

Independent claims 18 and 22 recite: "...the ground connector is longer than at least one active connector..." Similar to the argument made for claim 1, neither Riazat, Spangler, Patrick, Jr. nor Kjarsgaard discuss the ground connector being longer than the at least one active connector.

Claims 19-21 and 23-25 depend from claims 18 and 22, respectively, and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claims 19-21 and 23-25 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Patrick, Jr. and Kjarsgaard, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 21 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**Claims 26-30**

Claim 26 recites: "...the active connectors are shorter in length than the ground connector..." Similar to the argument made for claim 1, neither Riazat, Spangler, Patrick, Jr. nor Kjarsgaard discuss the active connectors being shorter than the ground connector.

Claims 27-30 depend from claim 26 and are therefore believed to be allowable for at least the foregoing reason. Further, claim 27-30 recite features that patentably distinguish over Riazat, Spangler, Patrick, Jr. and Kjarsgaard, taken alone or in combination. For example, claim 30 recites that the first connector is a laser diode connector and the second connector is a photodiode connector.

Withdrawal of the foregoing rejection is requested.

**CLAIM REJECTIONS – 35 USC 103**

Claims 11-14 were rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Riazat in

view of Kjarsgaard and further in view of Patrick, Jr.

Claims 11-14 have been cancelled.

## CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date:

January 20, 2006

By:

Gregory W. Harper

Gregory W. Harper  
Registration No. 55,248

1201 New York Avenue, NW, Suite 700  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501